

THE
High-Priest
OF
MELKSHAM,
HIS
Reasonings, his Concessions, and his
Self-Contradictions: Briefly Examined.
IN
A Sober VINDICATION of a
Paper Entituled, **Second Thoughts,**
Relating to the
QUAKERS.
BEING
A Reply to *Bobun Fox's*
Agrippa, &c.

By *Thomas Beaven, Jun.*

*Tho' he fall, he shall not be utterly cast down: for the
Lord upholdeth him with his hand, Psal. 37. 24.
After the way which they call Herise, so worship I
the God of my Fathers, believing all things which are
written in the Law and the Prophets, Acts 24. 14.*

London, Printed and Sold by J. Sowle, in White-Hart-
Court, in Gracious-street, 1707.

5/10

THE RIGHT OF

MELKSHAM

Resolving his Conventions and his
Self-contradictions: Being a

A 2nd VINDICATION of
the same, written by
Believing to the

OLAKERS



By Thomas Deane, Junr

It is not to be denied that the
author of this work has been
after the way which they call
the end of my labour, leaving all
others in the land and the people.

Printed and sold by J. Deane, in York
Court, in Chancery-lane.

M
R

Chr
A
another
happ
the
Refer
partic
Paper
than
betwe
Preac
ners
of C

THE
High-Priest
OF
MELKSHAM,
HIS
REASONINGS, &c.
Briefly Examined.

Christian Reader,

AS it is *too* common for *Misunderstandings* to arise among Persons of the *same* Profession, and *undue* Reflections one upon another, to *accompany* the same; so a *Difference* happening between *me*, and a *few* of my Friends, the *Quakers*, I had the *Unhappiness* to carry my Resentments *too* far, by much, against them in *particular*, and the People in *general*, as my first Paper sheweth; which yet were not *more publick* than the Differences in the Church of *England*, between *South* and *Sherlock*. *Edwards* in his Preacher against the Modern Doctrines and Manners of the Clergy. The *Upper* and *Lower Houses* of *Convocation*, about the *Archiepiscopal Power*.

of the *Bishop of Canterbury*, and the *Rights* of the *Lower House* of Convocation. And to these let me add the *open War* between *High-Church* and *Low Church*, which produceth daily so many *severe Invektives*, and *Preachments*, one against the other, that the same is become the *Observation* of every body.

Why this *High-Priest* should be angry with the *Quakers*, and *me*, for *ending* our Differences, any more than we ought to be angry with the *Church*, if they could as happily *end* theirs, I know not; or than I ought to be with *him*, if he should *print*, as well as *talk*, against the Oppressions he thinks *High Church* is under, (as greater than that of any *other Society* of Protestants) by the *Bishop of Canterbury's* extending the *Archiepiscopal Power* and *Prerogative*, and that upon *such* his printing, Matters should be *adjusted* to his Satisfaction; and occasion his signifying that *amicable Agreement* in Print; and induce him to censure the *Digressions* he might have made in his *first*, and the *severe Lashes*, that in his *Heat*, might Drop from his Pen, *too much* to the *general Prejudice* of the Church; which before, by reason of his Disgust, *he* might be *disposed* to Leave. I say, ought I to be angry at his *Second Print*, and interpose to shew his *Self-Contractions*; by no means: since *thereby* he would *act* like a Man of *Honour* and *Principle*, especially if he had *Offers* made him of *Interest* by the *Dissenters*, in case he would not write his *Second Thoughts*, but come over to them; when at the same time he thinks in his *Conscience*, that the *Church*, in the main, is preferable to *Dissenters*, as *my Conscience* told me, the *Quakers* are to all other Societies; tho' after I had wrote my *first Paper*, I had Offers

large

large
Quakers
give
their
grou
trary
If
to th
Man
shoul
as tha
traor
know
Parso
be the
thereo
tleman
therefo
Melksh
thinki
ry, eve
ble to
great t
to foil
the best
a Feath
not wit
he hath
particul
on (let
become
We a
which m
may edi
ow Pea
Man sha

large and inviting enough not to return to the Quakers; but not the least worldly Gain, either given, or promised me by the Quakers, to become their Friend again, notwithstanding the idle and groundless Suggestions of some Persons to the contrary.

If I had regard to *Worldly Honour*, ought I not to think it a considerable piece of *Glory*, that a Man of my Adversary's *great Learning*, and *Sense*, should think my *Second Thoughts* so *Considerable*, as that they required him, to exert himself in so extraordinary a manner? My Reader therefore must know, that he bears such Rank in the Club of Parsons, commonly called *High-Churchmen*, as to be their reputed *Chair-man*; and that upon account thereof, I have heard him called by a certain Gentleman, a Justice of Peace, the Priest of Priests; and therefore it is that I call him the *High-Priest* of *Melksham*. And give me leave to please my self with thinking, that he cannot justly acquire any *Glory*, even tho' he should, by his *great Learning*, be able to baffle a Man of my *little Reading*. But how great then must my *Honour* be, if I should chance to foil such a *powerful* Adversary? And since the *best Weapon* to break a Man's Head with, is a *Feather*, I intend to encounter my *Antagonist*, not with such *Heat* and *ungentle* Treatment, as he hath the Quakers in general, and my self in particular, but with that *Temper*, and *Moderation* (let him hate that Word if he will) which become a Christian.

We are commanded to follow after the things which make for Peace, and the things whereby one may edifie another, Rom. 14: 19. And to follow Peace, as well as Holiness, without which, no Man shall see the Lord, Heb- 12. 14.

Charity, which is Love *deservedly*, excels in the Christian Religion. And did the same take that place, which it ought, all the *Wounds* of this Nation, upon account of *Religion*, would soon be healed: The *different* Sentiments, of our Minds, in *Circumstantial* things, while we hold the *Head*, and all the *Essentials* of the Christian Religion, would not be *such Obstacles*; for we should no more *bate* one another for the *same*, than for the *Difference* of our *Features*, since we can no more help the one, than we can remedy the other.

This Priest hath drag'd me into a Controversie of this nature, and tho' therein I should not *engage* the Reader on my side, because the Prejudice of Custom and Education is a *Byass* against the Argument; yet I hope to say enough to convince the *Inspection*, that the Arguments (tho' they come from a Person, who this Priest says, is *forsaken by Common Sense*) are not *so irrational*, but 'tis possible, even for a *Wise Man*, to yield to their Evidence.

The inward *Sense* and *Feeling* of the *Holy Ghost*, and the Operation *thereof* in the Soul, *enlightening*, *converting* and *sanctifying* it (through Jesus Christ, who died for us) to the *Service* and *Glory* of God, is the Substance of *Quakerism*, alias, *Christianity*; and the Soul that *follows* this Guide, can never miss of *Glory*: But the *Decrees* of Councils, Synods and Convocations, the *Comments* and *Determinations* of Expositors, are *uncertain*, and *Contradictory Rules*. The *Papists* say *this*, and the Church of *England* says *that*, but it must be *agreed by all*, that as the *Holy Scriptures* are *plain* and *full* in themselves, respecting *every thing* necessary to be *believed* and *practis'd*, without

without the *help of Comment*; so all the *Convictions* and *Instructions* of the *Holy Ghost* in the Heart, whereby the *saving Knowledge* of God, and the *true Sense* of the Sacred Text is given, are to be *received*, and obeyed. And would *Men* but mind this *Heavenly Monitor* that is *always near* them, during a Day of Grace and Mercy, which God affords every Man, through Jesus Christ, there is nothing in the World would so thoroughly mend their *Lives* and *Manners*. We are apt to forget what we have *heard* and *read*; and even when we remember it, there is no *Warmth* or *Life* in it to the Soul, but what this *Instructor* (one of a Thousand) gives. As the *Great Decay* of a Christian Life and Conversation hath chiefly proceeded, from a *Disregard* to the Teachings of God in the Heart; so a turning to these Divine Teachings, would make us *Worshippers in Spirit* and *Truth*, would bring our Thoughts into the *Obedience* of Christ, make us *Holy* within and without, and replenish our Hearts with the *Influences* and *Foys* of God's Spirit, which are a Fore-taste of the *Pleasures* and *Delights* of that Kingdom and World which is without End.

'Tis no small Honour to the *Quakers*, that they bear this blessed *Witness* and *Testimony* to the World, a *Testimony* not to be ashamed of; and to die in the Cause thereof (as many have done in nasty Holes and Dungeons) is the greatest *Conquest* and *Glory*.

My Adversary begins his Dedication to the *Justice* with very *hard Words*, and a little too wide of Truth, by saying, I *assumed the Liberty of the Justice's Name*, in a very *insolent and unbecoming manner*, when at the same time he owns I did not mention it: And indeed, it was a *Que-*

tion with me, whether it was *him*, or another neighbouring Gentleman, 'till the Parson resolved that Doubt.

And altho' I think I have *reason* to complain, that a Neighbour, and a Justice too, should print any Paper of mine without my *Consent* or *Knowledge*, yet the *Respect* I have for the worthy Gentlemen (who my Antagonist informs me did it) obliges me to the contrary; believing that he intended me no Ill, but was prevailed with by my *Adversary*, or some body else, to do it under *some* other Consideration.

The *firm Friendship* that he says is between him and the *Justice*, I have no reason to *dislike*; but what he says of the Design of his *Studies*, puts me in mind of the one *short Readment* a Day (*called a Sermon*) for 130 Pound *per Annum*, which he makes to suffice at *Melksham*, for the sake of putting in his Pocket about 30 Pound *per Ann.* at *Seend*: How well *such Management* (which some are so unmannerly as to call *Covetous*) is approved by his Hearers, I shall not determine, that is his *Business* to enquire: But I can tell him, *some* of them (that are not like School-boys, who care not how little they have for their Money) do not *relish* it very well, nor I suppose does the Bishop.

I take his Preface to have nothing of Argument or Sobriety in it, but to have so much of that call'd *Envy*, and *ill Will* against my *Father* and my *Self*; and the Reflections therein to be so *ungenteel*, that the same only deserves to be *despised* and *loathed*.

He begins his Reflections Page 28. Paragraph 2d. with a Mistake, in saying, *That my Assigning the Re-printing and Dispersing my first Paper without my Order, as the Reason for the Publication of my Second Thoughts, is nothing but an empty Pre-*
tence,

rence, since there was but about 20 of those I printed dispersed, and they only *here*, where my Conversation and verbal Discourses would have sufficiently answered them; and therefore he may depend upon it, I had not answered it in *Print*, had it not been *Re-printed*. So that I see a *Priest*, and a *High-Priest* too, is as liable to overshoot himself, as another Man; and to do *so* at the Entrance, seems *omenous* upon him.

In his 3d Paragraph he is pleas'd to tell us (if we will believe him) That *the design of the Gentleman who re-printed my first Paper, was, To open the Eyes of some deluded People*. Who he means he has not told us *here*; but if the *Quakers* (as the last Paragraph of his last Page shews) he ought to *prove them so*, before he gives such *unhandsome* Words. He tells me in the same Paragraph, That for my part, *I have no Reputation to lose*. I would ask him then, What *Reputation* he thinks to *gain* by attacking me? and whether he has not contradicted this himself, Page 33. in relation to my Arguments for the Disuse of *Outward Baptism* and *the Supper*, in saying of me on that Head. *Indeed to do Justice to his Character* (if the Case was not too plain to be puzzled) he has gone as far in it as most Men before him? 'Tis no wonder that my *Second Paper* should contradict my *First*, for that was in part the Design of it; but that this *High-Priest*, who makes it his Business, to manifest to the World my *Contradictions* (which I had shewn before my self, which shews his Wisdom) should fall immediately to **Contradicting himself**, is *unaccountable* (I had like to have used his own Word, and said, *Unpardonable*) in a Man of his profound Learning and Sense; tho' in a *Druggist-Maker* it would signifie but little.

His

His 4th Paragraph says upon my *Second Thoughts*, That he is afraid the Reader will conclude, there has been more of the Serpent, than of the Dove, in all this Management. This is as if I was a Cunning Fellow; and yet towards the End of his 53 Page he says, That the softest thing which could be said of me, would be, that I was out of my Wits: This is another Demonstration of his **Self-Contradiction**.

Again, he says of me, p. 47. My Understanding is quite broken. And yet p. 36. I must here remind this Writer of a Slight of Hand he would put upon us. A Man whose Understanding is quite broken, must needs have a mighty Slight of Hand! and how sound his Understanding must be, that could penetrate into such an *obstruse* Mystery!

Again, p. 37. He informs his Reader, that I am forsaken by Common Sense. And yet says p. 41. I am afraid we are going to have another Slight of his Hand. And again p. 44. he says, Ironically, Our Author can defend himself against all Adversaries by the Greek, which I doubt not but he understands as accurately, as any Drugget-Maker in the Parish. And yet p. 52. he says, Whereas the Quakers formerly despised all Human Learning, they now seem a little better reconciled to it; but should the Rest of the World use it like this Author, all Ingenious Men (for it seems Ingenious Men don't belong to the World) would loath and abhor it: For I solemnly declare, I had rather not be able to read my Letters, than prostitute Learning to such wicked and ungodly Purposes. Here are three more of his **Self-Contradictions**; and to these let me add, his telling the Justice in his Dedication, that I had Exposed his Name in an insolent and unbecoming manner; and yet in the

the next Words owns, *I did not directly mention it.* To use his own Words, *p. 55. Were ever Right Hand and Left so terribly engaged before?*

And again, *p. 41. To consult the Scriptures, and draw out from thence, a full and impartial account of this matter (viz. the Supper) alas, this is none of his Business.* And yet he says in *p. 43. Our Author would have you believe, he is giving you a full account of this matter, out of the New Testament, in the following Pages.* Then it seems he owns, tho' to his own **Self-Contradiction**, in matter of *fact*, that I made it *some* of my Business; but whether I did it awkwardly or no, shall be considered anon.

Well, this makes *Five*, and *Two before* makes *Seven*; just as many Heads as I divided my *Second Thoughts* into, in but Three of which I contradicted my first Paper (*viz.*) on *Tythes, Baptism and the Supper, and the Hat and Language*, as any body may see, by comparing my Two Papers, the rest being rather *Explanations*, than *Contradictions*; so that my Adversary has out done me, more than *two to one*; and therefore I return him his own Words, *Page 55. The greatest Wound that can be given to Truth, is Self-Contradiction.*

I contradicted my self in my *Second*, upon the *Convictions* of my own Conscience, that I had missed it in my *First*, which is a good and honourable Foundation; for 'tis no Shame for a Man to *Confess his Faults*, and amend; but let him say if he can, that **his Contradictions** proceeded from such a Bottom; and then let us see, whether my Adversary, or I, come off with the greater Reputation; my *Contradictions* were in *Matters of Opinion*, for which I gave my Reasons;

sons; but his in *Matters of Fact*, which he says, *Page 55. is unpardonable; and the Character that such a Man deserves, is blacker than Ink*: So that this *High-Priest* has pinn'd himself down effectually, so high as he is; and if his Conscience is not too obdurate, we shall see in his next his Recantations.

I am now come to the end of his 4th Paragraph, where he promises to *Go on according to the Method I have prescribed him*, which in Breach of that Promise, he varies from before he ends; but that is not the *only* Instance which might be given of his *breaking his Word*.

1st, Of the *Discipline of Lavington Monthly-Meeting, as in his 29th Page.*

As to his suggesting my *base Compliance* to the said Monthly-Meeting, tho' I don't esteem myself *obliged* to give him a *particular* account on what Terms I became *Reconciled* to them, and they to me; yet this I will tell him, as I hinted in my second Paper, that it was upon a *Right Understanding* one of another, and a *Good Foundation* of mutual Brotherly Love for time to come: The Love of God enclining and moving us to seek Reconciliation one with another, my *Dissatisfactions* being removed to their *Approbation*, and my *Content*. And seeing my Adversary endeavours to *debase* and *redicule* me, and our Friends, to reproach us what he can, and will not believe what I say, I must tell him, I do not intend to accept him for a *Judge* of the *Particulars* of our Agreement: But being now *fully satisfied* of their *true Christian Principles*, I tell the Priest, I am *very sorry* the former *Hard Thoughts* I had of them

them should overcome me so far, as to expose that Meeting so severely and unhandfomly, as I did in my first Print.

2d. Of Tythes.

In his 1st Paragraph upon this Head, he says, *He shall not now Examine the Solution I have given to that Objection, that the Disciples of Christ did not refuse to pay Tythes to the Jewish Priesthood. Neither will he enter into the Controversie of the Divine Right of Tythes, but angrily Charges me with attacking Lesly (his Brother High-Churchman) in a scurrilous manner, which shews his Breeding and Education, as well as that he is self-condemned in his Treatment of me, in saying, I have no Reputation to lose, page 28. This Author's size of Honesty, page 30. his Credit does not run high enough at present, &c. page 32. when Men forsake common Honesty, they are forsaken by common Sense, page 37. will this Writer rub his forehead, page 38. the Punishment of this naughty deserter, page 50. that he prostitutes Learning to wicked and ungodly purposes, page 52. that the softest thing which can be said of him, would be, that he was out of his wits, the Character such a Man deserves is blacker than Ink, page 55. Whether my Reader will think this is attacking in a scurrilous manner or no: This High-Priest concludes, my saying Lesly is no Reputation to the Church of England, (as her Members well know) must needs be so. But if he approves Lesly's disaffection to the Late and Present Government, his Propositions for a Union between the Church of France, and the Church of England, by the first abating the Popes Supremacy, and the*
last

last the Kings. I say if he approves of *these things*, I shall only refer him to the *Queens Declaration*, to the Convocation, for Answer, and think him such another *Subject* as *Lesly*, 'till he purges himself of *such Imputations*. And I take no other notice here, tho' I may deal with him anon, for *the horrid Blasphemies, and Heretical Tenets* he would Charge the *Founder, and Chief Leaders of the Quakers* withal. Language that better becomes the Mouth of a *bloody Bonner*, than that of a *Clergy-Man* of the *English Church*.

In his 2d Paragraph on Tythes, he tells us, *what a miserable Condition they (viz. the Church Clergy) would be in, were they to depend upon Charity*. I would fain ask him then, how he thinks the *Ministers of the Presbyterians, Independants and Baptists*, do live or subsist? Or hath he a better Opinion of the *Charity of Dissenters*, than of his own Hearers? on whom this is no *small Reflection*, as well as on himself. Yea, and what does he think of the *Quakers*? who as they *have freely received, freely give, without money, and without Price*. For tho' I own with the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. 9. 11. that those who have sown *Spiritual things*, may reap *such Carnal things*, of those to whom they have sown *Spiritual*, as are necessary for their subsistence in this World; Yet with the same Apostle, the *Quakers* are not willing to make the Gospel *Chargeable*, but by their own *Labour and Industry* provide for themselves, and Families. But then let my *Learned Antagonist* tell me, by what *Authority* derived from Christ, or any of his *Apostles*, he claims *Wages or Maintenance* from them, to whom he has *not sown Spiritual things*, (*viz.*) from them who are so far from *pertaking* of his Ministry, that they even
refuse

refuse for Conscience sake, to sit under the same? and then he will do something; but 'till that is done, he does nothing. For the Dispute is not whether those that hear him, should pay him, but whether these that do not, should pay him. And thus his 2d and 3d Paragraphs are Answered; his 4th, 5th and 6th, about the Law of the Country, shall be considered by and by. In the mean while I observe, he says toward the latter end of his 31st Page, that I give these Reasons why the Quakers can't in Conscience pay Tythes, (viz.)

- 1. Their Dedication is grossly Superstitious.*
- 2. They are required to be paid as an Act of Divine Worship.*
- 3. The Gospel doth not enjoyn the Payment of Tythes at all, much less as a part of Gods Worship.*

Let us hear how he Answers these Reasons, why he says *the last of these is no reason at all.* (that is, say I, no reason that he thinks fit to Answer) for, says he, *The Question is not whether the Payment of Tythes be enjoyned in the Gospel, but whether it is forbidden? if not, we are bound to obey all human Ordinances concerning them. I beg his Pardon, I put the Question Right, and 'tis he that would put it wrong, in Justification of the Old Popish Notion, That all things are Lawful in the Worship (or Service of God,) that are not forbidden. From whence the Papists plead for the Lawfulness of owning the Pope's Supremacy, Transubstantiation, their Infallibility in delivering Points of Faith, Prayers to Saints and Angels, Purgatory, and other Fopperies imposed on the belief of Christians, because (say they) the Scripture does not forbid these things. It will not be amiss to put my Adversary in mind, what Dr. Stil-*
lingsfleet

[10]

fleet in his Discourse concerning the Idolatry of Rome says, page 175. in Answer to his Popish Adversaries Plea (viz.) *The short Resolution of our Faith is this, That we ought to believe nothing as an Article of Faith, but what God hath revealed; and the compleat Revelation of God's will to us, is contained in the Bible.* As this is the Protestant Plea for Dissenting from the Romish Church, so 'tis the Dissenters Plea for their Nonconformity to the Church of England; for the Church enjoyns some things besides Tythes, to be believed, and done in the worship of God, which are not taught in the Gospel; which I am not willing to nominate here; but if my Antagonist will not be satisfied without it, I may oblige him with a Catalogue of a few of them in my Next: But to return.

The Parson left what followed my 3^d Reason (as he calls it) which is as follows; *And therefore, according to the Christian Principle of Protestants, (that whatsoever is required of us as any part of Divine Worship, which is not enjoined in the Gospel, is superstitious,) Tythes ought to be testified against, as their Case now standeth.*

This High Priest did not like this Argument, 'twas too home and powerful for him, and therefore he very mannerly let it alone; but I hope my Reader will take notice of it, 'tis a Point of Great Consequence, for not only the denial of Tythes turns upon it, but the Ground of Dissenters, Separation from the Church as before.

He is also very angry in page 32. for my saying, *Tythes were Superstitiously dedicated by King Ethelwolf*, as if I had pinched him in the tender part, the Belly. And yet he is forced to own, that in saying so, I spoke the Truth; but 'tis
such

Such Truth as he would not have the *People* know. In page 33. he pleaseth himself with an Error in *Transcribing*, or *Printing*, 32 of *H. 8.* instead of 27 *Hen. 8.* an Error he knew I had Corrected with my Pen, in those Papers I brought from *London* with me, long before his were Printed, it being 27th of *Hen. 8th*, in the *Manuscript* I had by me. This is Playing at *small Game*, and I could ballance with him, by paying him above twenty such kind of small Errors, which are in his; but this is *trifling*, and better becomes him, (who deals in *Niceties* and *Toys*) than a fair *Antagonist*. He owns that the 27th of *Hen. 8th*, declares *Tythes* to be due to God and Holy Church; and yet he says, *this doth not necessarily infer that they are due of divine Right in the Judgment of that very Parliament.* As if a thing could be due to God, and yet not by *Divine Right*. Here is *rare* arguing, and to use his own words, *who can help falling down to such demonstration?* ha'n't he spoke like an *Oracle*? but I beseech him to be above board in his next, and tell me *Ingeniously* whether he don't believe King *Henry 8ths* Parliament that declared *Tythes* to be due to God and Holy Church, did hold the *Divine Right* of *Tythes*, for I believe he has argued against his own Conscience, and (as appears against) his Brother *Lesly*, who positively affirms they did, in his Essay, &c.

But I find my Adversary is upon the Borders of another *Popish Argument*; that things once dedicated to God, howsoever *Superstitious* and *Erroneous*, cannot be apply'd again to *Civil Uses*, without being guilty of *Sacrilege*. Look about you *Impropriators*! look about you the Possessors

of the Lands of the dissolved Abbeyes and Monasteries! if ever it *be* in such Mens power, have at ye.

But why all this bustle by a *Protestant* Clergy, for what was given to a *Popish* one? for I fancy the *Papists* look upon the *Protestant* Clergy, to be what my Adversary represents the *Quakers*, *no better than Thieves and Robbers*.

Now then to his Fourth 5th and 6th Paragraphs, about the *Law of our Country*. It appearing even by his own Concessions, that Tythes were *Superstitiously* and *Popishly* dedicated; and that they are *even now* required by Law to be paid, as *due to God and Holy Church*; and that he cannot say the Gospel enjoyns the Payment of Tythes at all, much less as a part of God's worship; nothing in the world can be plainer, (and the more I look into it, the better I see it) than that every true Protestant ought conscientiously to deny the Payment thereof; since no human Law can bind the Conscience in Matters that relate to Religion, and the worship of God, without a Divine Law, (as is acknowledged by several Clergymen of the Church of England,) and a Liberty to Dissent for our Conscience towards God in this matter, is a Right of the Christian Church. Tho' as it is the Law of the Country, we patiently suffer, 'till God shall think fit to encline the Legislature, to ease us of this *Jewish and Popish Yoak of Tythes*, (which is a Yoak (to use the words of the Apostle) that neither we nor our Fathers were able to bear.) Give me leave to call it a Popish Yoak, since I am fully of the mind, and would enter the Lists with any body upon this Head (*viz.*) That whatsoever is appointed by Man as a part of Religion, and the Service of God, without a Divine Precept, is Superstition and Will-Worship.

And

And therefore that I may keep my Conscience clear of this *Superstition* and *Will-worship*, I am obliged to deny the Payment of Tythes; tho' at the same time if any body should be so blind as I was, to tell me in Relation to the *English Clergy*, as a Papist might do in *France*, for my refusing to pay a *Popish Priest* for saying Mass; and that the Mass Priest has as good a Title to Tythes, &c. as I have to my Estate, and that I invade his Property in keeping his Tythes, as much as in detaining from him any other just Debt, and tell me my Christianity obliges me, and I would others to have bid *Morals*, and bid me blush for shame, all this argues nothing, for God is to be obeyed rather than Man, no Law of Man can hallow or excuse Will-worship.

But there is one thing I must not forget, and that is page 33. he tells me, *there is Comfort to all Impropriators, for due to God and Holy Church is not in 32 Hen. 8.* tho' he says, 'tis in the 27th Hen. 8. what then is become of their Comfort? but let us hear his Brother Lesly a little, in the 151st and 152d Pages of his *Essay concerning the Divine Right of Tythes*, (viz.) *There can no pretence be made for the Lawfulness of Impropriations, when those very Acts of Parliament which took them from the Church, and gave them to Laymen, do acknowledge that they are Gods Dues, and his Right. That they are due to God, and Holy Church, as in 27 Hen. 8. cap. 20. nay they were always so acknowledged, and no otherwise, insomuch that there was no Law, or Presedent for a Layman to sue for Tythes, it was utterly heterogeneous and abhorrent: For which Reason, when Tythes were given to Laymen, they were forced to have a particular Act of Parliament, 32 of Hen. 8. Chap. 7. to Enable Lay-*

B 2

men

men to sue for Tythe, which before they could not do; in which very *Act Tythe is named, as being due to Almighty God.* Thus far him, in Contradiction to my Adversary. And indeed those that shall look into the Book of Statutes, will find that the Parliament of 27th Hen. 8. met the 4th of Feb. and continued their Sessions but to the 14th of April next after, which was about 69 Days; that in this very Sessions they both declared Tythes to be due to God and Holy Church, and alienated Tythes of Monasteries, Priories, &c. to the King and his Heirs for ever.

His Argument about Hospitals, &c. which he calls a *solemn Confutation of Trifles*, is so little to the purpose, that I fancy upon 2d thoughts, he will be ashamed thereof. For are their Rents requir'd to be paid as a Divine Right? for the maintenance of a set of Men, that under the notion of watching for Souls, catch Pigs, and fat Benefices; and instead of Promoting Religion and Reformation, have been obstacles in the work thereof. The Reformation in England was not chiefly carried on by the Clergy, but by the Laity; and 'twas no sooner brought to some tolerable head, but the Priests were longing again, after the Onions and Garlick, the Arbitrary, and Independent Power of the Romish Priesthood, and most Cordially embraced Tythes, and Rich Livings, the profitable part of Popery, and grew angry that they had not the fingering of the *Improprate Tythes*, and the Lands of the dissolved Abbies and Monasteries. And 'tis but seven years ago *Leſly* the Parson's worthy Friend, sounded such an alarm in our Ears, in his Book of the *Divine Right of Tythes*, that one would have thought the whole Nation had been damn'd. In the 189th

Page
a pa
Page
of o
join
advi
and t
centl
er at
Tyth
the L
fering
of the
that l
der to
and m
Tythes
thereo
that R
tion w
Domin
force t
Priest-C
Of w
and
I hav
nies in
need no
fire my
will find
are negl
hath att
follow h
In his
to my C

Page thereof, he positively avers, that *Tythes are a part of God's Worship, yea, of Direct Worship.* Page 30. *the Honour due to his Name, the Worship of our Tythes.* Page 153. and that our Laws enjoin the Payment of them as such; (I would advise my Adversary and him to agree that point) and that this *Act of Divine Worship* might be decently performed; he has prescribed a long Prayer at the End of his Book to be said by the Tythe-Payer, the first Part to the *Parson*, and the Last to God, when he comes to make an Offering to the Priest of *some* of his Tythes in lieu of the whole. I will lend the Book to any body that has a mind to learn that fine Prayer, in order to down upon his Knees to this *High-Priest*, and make an Offering of the Prayer, and the Tythes, to obtain the Priest's Blessing at the End thereof, upon Condition that he will let me see that *Rare Sight*. To what a lamentable Condition would the *Clergy*, grasping after *Power and Dominion*, reduce all the Laity, if they could, but force them to yield their Necks to the *Toak of Priest-Craft*?

Of Water-Baptism and the Supper with Bread and Wine.

I have said so much about those *two Ceremonies* in my Second Paper, that I have the *less* need now to be *tedious* thereon; and therefore desire my Reader to give it *another view*, and he will find some of my *most Material Arguments* are neglected by my *Adversary*, and in those he hath attempted, he is unsuccessful: However I shall follow him where he nibbles.

In his 1st Paragraph he pretends to do Justice to my Character, by saying, *I have gone as far*

in it as most Men before me, yet remembering a Sport he sometimes uses, it tickled his Fancy to talk on't, and therefore he compares me to a Hare, saying, Methinks I see him quite out of Breath, making his Works, and panting after every Thicket for fear of a Pursuer. This is fanciful enough; but now comes the business: Before he has done with me, he will convince his Reader (if he can) that the more I write on this Subject, the more awkwardly I handle it: Then there are terrible things at hand, ay that there are; for he tells the Reader, I make use of Three Fallacies, (that's a Company of them) the detecting whereof, will in a great measure, shew the Weakness of all which I have advanced on this Subject; lets hear 'em then.

*Why, first a Supposition that our Two Sacraments are yet **only** parts of the Jewish Law, notwithstanding (says he) our blessed Lord hath so evidently made them standing parts of the Christian Religion (notwithstanding, say I, that is a Mistake, and what he will never be able to prove.)*

Secondly, An Application of all those Texts of Scripture, which have a Reference to those Jewish Rites, which are confessedly abolished; to the two Christian Sacraments, which are as manifestly always to be retained (Sacrament is not a Scripture Word, but a Term borrowed from a Military Order, &c. among the Heathen; and he having owned Page 38. 41. that Water-Baptism, and the Supper with Bread and Wine, were Jewish Rites; I presume, 'tis past his Skill to alter their Property, and make them Christian.)

Thirdly, A wresting these places which give a preference to the inward part of the Sacraments (he intends by that heathenish Word, Baptism and the Supper) and which we all acknowledge, (says

(f
ma
An
Su
fess
An
tur
enc
wh
kno
Do
pera
shou
I
to ca
see
I
the
moni
thus
I.
2.
3.
4.
5.
nical
say I,
Easter
ny H
yet en
5.
bout
wheth
be the

(says he) ought to be preferred) as if they were so many Proofs that the outward are to be neglected. And sure, if the inward Part of Baptism and the Supper, ought to be preferred, as he himself Confesses, Why is not that Duty put in practice? And then why don't People wait upon God, and turn to his Teachings by his Spirit, and the Influences and Operations thereof in their own Hearts, whereby Baptism and the Supper, in Spirit, is known? Nay, why are not People taught this Doctrine by their Pastors? unless it is fearing if peradventure they come to the Substance, they should thereby see no need of the Sign, or Shadow.

I say in the Parsons Words, If the Reader please to carry these Observations along with him, he will see the use of them in the present case.

I am now come to examine, what he says, of the Difficulties I met with, relating to these Ceremonies, and which he quotes, in his 34th Page, thus,

1. To whom the Indisputable Power of Administration is delegated, or given?
2. Who are the proper Subjects thereof?
3. The time when, and manner how, the same is to be received?
4. Whether the Bread in the Supper must be Leavened, or Unleavened? Which (says he Ironically) is a weighty Doubt indeed. And which, say I, (if he be Ignorant) let him know, the Eastern and Western Churches differed about many Hundred Years ago, and the Dispute is not yet ended.

5. The Efficacies of each of these Ceremonies, about which Christians could never agree; as also, whether the Bread, and Wine after Consecration, be the very Body and Blood of Christ, as Papists

say? Or whether the Body and Blood of Christ, is in or under the same, as Lutherans hold? Or whether it be neither of these, as Calvinists say? Nay, the Romanists worship the Bread after Consecration, which is Idolatry. Well, what Solution does he give to those Difficulties? What has he done to Clear up the Way to a Doubting-Soul? Why, just nothing at all, Gallio like, he cares for none of these things; and therefore don't so much as pretend to answer one of these Objections. The Reader perhaps will think, 'twas because he could not; and I Challenge him, in his next, if that be not the Reason of it, to untie this Knot (as he calls it) and give a full and Catagorical Answer to these Questions, with that Clearness and Fairness, as becomes a Man pretending to his Post in Religion; and shew what Inherent Vertue there is in these Signs, as pertaining to the Conscience, and not put me off with a What if he should be in doubt hereafter concerning the Choice of his Religion in general? I could reckon unto him as many seeming Difficulties, as he has muster'd up about the Sacrament: Why perhaps the Parsons Talent lies most that way. And indeed the Loose Lives of so many of the Clergy, would make one think some of them believe nothing of Religion themselves, but only make use of their Calling, as other Crafts-men do theirs, to get a Penny by it; than which, Drugget Making is ten times more Honourable.

He seems to own, p. 35. that these Ceremonies are not absolutely necessary to Salvation; and then how he will prove his Assertion that they are generally so, we shall see in his next. He says, 'Tis past his Understanding, to comprehend how these Signs should be set by me, upon the same Foot with Purifica-

Purification in the Temple, Circumcision, &c. here he ends. But let my Reader observe, I added, *Abstaining from things strangled, and the eating of Blood,* Acts 15. 29. *Anointing the Sick with Oil in the Name of the Lord.* James 5. 14. things, I tell him, enjoined by the *Holy Ghost*, or commanded by the *Apostles*, as those Scriptures shew; and yet not observed by the Church. He knew this pinch'd him, and therefore pretends not to *understand* it; which shews his *Weakness*, or worse.

He take notice, that I concluded, *it would be for the Promotion of Christianity, not to judge one another in respect of Meats and Drinks* (that are called *Sacramental*) *because they are but Shadows of things to come; but the Body or Substance is of Christ.* I am still of the same mind, nor does he deny it, but is very angry that I should put *Sacramental* among the *Apostles Words*; but it was put in a *Parentesis*, to shew that 'twas not the *Apostle's Word*, but *my Comment*; and no body but a Man of his size for *Honesty* (if I may use his own Words, Page 30. without having it called *Foul Language*) would have given me such *unhandsome* Treatment for so doing, through want of better Argument and Memory, to call to mind his own Practice in his Title Page.

Having recited the Text at large, Col. 2. 16, 17. he says, *Who sees not that these words can be Interpreted of nothing but the several Judaical Observances there mentioned, which we all own to be abolished by the Coming of Christ?* Agreed, and my End is answered: But who sees not, that he by this, has given away his Cause? since he acknowledges, Page 41. That *this Custom of breaking Bread, and drinking Wine, was used when the Passover was Celebrated*; and says of me, that I have plainly
proved

[40]
proved the Jews had this Rite, which must needs therefore be a Judaical Observance. And then, if the several Judaical Observances mentioned, Col. 2. 16, 17. are abolished, (as he confesses) Bread and Wine, being Meat and Drink, and Meat and Drink being there mentioned, (as a Religious Observance) the same is abolished by the Coming of Christ, (as he says; or rather I say, by his Suffering upon the Cross, as Col. 2. 14.) and then there is an End of this Ceremony, in point of Obligation: This I think is unanswerable.

I come now to his Page 36. where I find him entering thus, on Mat. 28. 19. *If to Baptize, and to Wash, are Words originally of the same Import, and washing implies Water; then, though the Word Water is not mentioned, the thing is plainly commanded.* If by *Water* he means (as I did) *Material, or Elementary Water*, which I suppose he does, then I answer thus. I agree, that to baptize and to wash, are Words originally of the same Import; but *Washing*, or *Baptizing*, does not always imply *Water*; and the Word *Water* being not mentioned, the thing is not plainly commanded. This is fair Arguing, and foils my Adversary's Chief Argument.

If he should demand a Scripture Instance, where in *Washing* or *Baptizing* does not imply *Water*, I shall give him two (viz.) Mat. 3. 11. *He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with Fire.* Here is *Baptizing* or *Washing* with the Spirit, and with Fire. And the Promise of Christ, Acts 1. 5. *Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.* Here again is *Washing* with the Spirit, or *Spiritual-Baptism*.

He says, to shift this Text off with a Figurative sense, and a Spiritual Baptism, is wretchedly ridiculous;

culous; (these delicious words shew him so angry with this *Spiritual Baptism*, that one would think he had never known the *Heavenly Laver*,) *unless it can be first shewn* (says he) *that the words cannot be understood in their plain literal meaning*; but say I, that is a wrong putting of the Question; for it is whether the words cannot be understood in a *Spiritual Sense*; and if they can, as I have proved by the two Instances I gave, they may. (and I must add *ought*, or else we should exclude the *true Gospel Baptism*) then all he has advanced upon this Head falls to the Ground, and he must begin again.

Upon my saying that *Christ's Baptism* (which is with the Spirit) from *John's* (which is with water) is as clearly and evidently contradistinguished as their Persons, for which I quoted *Mat. 3. 11.* and *Mark 1. 8.* which most manifestly prove my assertion. He says, *he must put me in mind of a slight of hand I would put upon them, in making the ground of the distinction between John's Baptism and Christ's to lie here, as if one was with Water, and the other without.* If this be a slight of hand, 'tis such an one as the *Holy Ghost* thought fit to make in the *Sacred Scriptures*, as the Places above quoted shew; whereas (saith he) *in truth they were both Water-Baptisms.* This is to make himself wiser than the *Holy Penmen*, a bold presumption! he don't dare to say the Apostles were Baptized with Water in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, well knowing he was not able to prove it; and yet (in favour of the *Quakers*) owns they were Compleat Christians nevertheless, in contradiction to the form of Administration, which he says is prescribed, p. 39. but then demands of the *Quakers*, such *miraculous* proofs

proofs of their *Spiritual Baptism* as the *Apostles* gave ; and then he will confess that God is in them (i. e. the Quakers) of a truth. But does he believe that none are Baptized with the *Baptism of the Spirit*, but those who have such Miracles? If so, what is become of the *Inward and Spiritual Grace of Baptism* in this Age, which he owns is preferable to the outward Sign? Page 34. and to be the Principle part of Baptism, page 37.

The Inward operation of the Holy Ghost in the heart, is sufficient (if submitted to) to Baptize or wash the same, from the Corruptions of our fallen Nature: And Holy Fruits proceeding from such Holy Souls, are sufficient demonstrations that God is in them of a Truth, let them be Quakers, or others.

Notwithstanding the hard words he gives me, as not sincerely quoting the Apostle Peter, Acts II. 16. my Reader (by comparing it with the Bible) will find that I did it *verbatim* ; and he cannot deny but the Place proves what I mentioned it for (*viz.*) that the Apostle Peter was made a Minister of the Baptism of the Spirit to the Gentiles. Ay, but I should have mentioned what that Apostle said in Chap. 10. 48. why so I did, within 14 Lines after ; but then he asks me what I mean by some of the Gentiles? a fair Writer would have said those very Gentiles who had received the Holy Ghost before.

Why they were but some of the Gentiles that believed, which Peter commanded to be Baptized with Water, let him say the contrary if he thinks fit, and as for their being first Baptized with the Holy Ghost, I know it as well as him, and never denied it ; but am glad he has given me

me an opportunity to open that Text, which purely for *Brevities* sake I omitted before.

In the 44th verse of the 10th of the *Acts* 'tis said, *that while Peter yet spake these words, the holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word.* From which let my Reader note, that this is a Confirmation of what I said in my former, that the *Apostle Peter* was made a Minister of the *Baptism of the Spirit*; for the *holy Ghost* fell on his Auditory while he was speaking to them; at which the Jews which believed being astonished, *Peter* said ver. 47. *can any Man forbid water that these should not be Baptized, which have received the holy Ghost as well as we,* v. 48. *and he commanded them to be Baptized in the name of the Lord.* Perhaps I shall startle my Reader, when I say this Place is in favour of Quakerism: For let my Reader Consider, first that had *Peter* understood *Water Baptism* to be Commanded in *Mat. 28. 19.* he would not have asked whether any Man could forbid it, but proceeded forthwith to the executing thereof; but his asking leave of the *Jewish Converts*, shews that he did it in compliance with a *Jewish Rite*, and not a *Christian Precept.* 2^d, That had he commanded them to be *Baptized* in pursuance of the Commission, *Mat. 28. 19.* understanding *Water* to be there meant, he would have commanded them to be *Baptized in the name of the Father Son and Holy Ghost.* Nor do I think my Adversary will conclude (contrary to so many Councils and Synods, and even the Rubrick of the Church and his own words, page 39.) that any are *Baptized* as they ought to be, who are not *so Baptized.* And then what is become of his Taunts and Boasting upon this place, and his saying *I for-*
sake

fake common Honesty, and am forsaken by common Sense; in shewing that the same Apostle compelled (which was more than Commanded) the Gentiles to live as do the Jews, Gal. 2. 3. to 14.

He tells me, 'tis trifling to observe that this Apostle defines Baptism not to be the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God, 1 Pet. 3. 21. but let him call it trifling, or what else he pleases, I care not; since 'tis such a Truth that he cannot deny. He tells me page 38. *Circumcision is that of the Heart in the Spirit not in the Letter, Rom. 2. 29.* and asks, *will this Writer therefore rub his forehead, and affirm the Jews were not outwardly circumcised?* I answer no. But then will he but rub his Eyes and he may see, that the Apostle intends not *Legal* but *Gospel Circumcision*, by which the Fathers understand Baptism; and his Objection vanisheth like smoak. For as that Apostle was for laying aside *outward Circumcision in the flesh*, (as but a Sign or Ceremony) by magnifying and calling to the *Inward*, as the Substance; so for the same Reason it is, that the Quakers are for laying aside *outward Baptism in the flesh*, as but a Sign or Ceremony, not by robbing the Church of Baptism, but by magnifying and calling to the *Inward Baptism of the Spirit*, which is the Substance, and one Gospel Baptism.

I observe he quotes me, page 38. saying, *This Baptism of the Spirit is the one Baptism now in force*, without pretending to answer it. But is offended that I said *the Apostle Paul was not sent to Baptize with water*, 1 Cor. 1. 17. tho' he allows *Water-Baptism* to be there intended. I will therefore recite the Passage at large, beginning at ver. 14. *I thank God (says the Apostle) that I Baptized*

Ba
an
Na
ni
oth
pre
of
am
ing
not
H
not
miss
pre
God
than
too,
mine
have
him
Circ
Custo
that
lute
Chri
than
fraid
them
him
this,
plain
He
zed,
Answ
will
cise?

Baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius, least any should say that I had Baptized in mine own Name, and I Baptized also the Household of Stephanus; besides I know not whether I Baptized any other; for Christ sent me not to Baptize, but to preach the Gospel.

'Tis to be observed the *Divisions* of the Church of Corinth, were about *Persons*. *I am of Paul, I am of Apollo, &c.* in which doubtless their *Preaching* was as much concerned as their *Baptizing*, if not more.

Having made that Remark, I proceed to take notice, that if the Apostle had received a *Commission* from Christ, to *Baptize* as well as to *preach the Gospel*, he would no more have *thanked* God for his neglect of *one part* of his *Commission*, than the *other*; and gave such a Reason for it too, *least any should say that I had Baptized in mine own Name*. Which Charge he needed not to have feared, if his *Commission* would have *born him out*; which shews that he *Baptized*, as he *Circumcised*, *Acts 16. 3.* in *meer compliance to Custom, and the circumstances of the Times*; and that therefore he is to be understood in an *absolute and proper sense*, when he adds, *v. 17. for Christ sent me not to Baptize*. The Sum is, he *thanks* God he *Baptized* no more, and seems *afraid* of being called to account for *Baptizing* them that he had, because Christ *did not send* him to *Baptize*. Any unbiaſſed Reader may see this, not to be a *force* upon the Text, but the *plain easie and natural sense* thereof.

He thinks it an Absurdity to say *Paul Baptized, and yet Christ did not send him to Baptize*. Answer, not at all, for he *Circumcised*, and yet will the Parson say *Christ sent him to Circumcise?*

I must

I must commend his Candid Confession that *Baptism or Purification with Water was one of the Initiating Ordinances for the Jewish Profelytes.* And then tell him in plainness that *Christ never appointed or Designed, any of the Ceremonies of the Law, for standing Ordinances of the Gospel:* Nor will all the Clergymen in the World be ever able to prove it.

I was as inclinable as any body to a *veneration of those two Ceremonies, Water-Baptism, and the outward Supper;* but the more near I approached them in my affections, the more empty I saw them, and the better I became sensible they were *ceased, and void in point of obligation.*

He has not advanced the least tittle new in their Vindication which I had not considered hundreds of times before he wrote; and I must seriously tell him the *Quakers* have so much *Scripture, Reason, and Experience* on their side, that all his Writing against them will be *fruitless and ineffectual, and rather establish then stagger* them.

To tell us *Christ could adapt this Rite into his own Religion, and make it a standing Ordinance of it if he thought fit, as the Parson does, page 38.* is to acknowledge, first that it is not of the *nature of his Religion, or does not appertain to it without Adoption;* and thereby to yield me all that I have said respecting *its own nature.* Secondly, That he had Power to do so, but not to prove that *the God of Order* has so *inverted the Nature and Order of things, as to call the Rights and Ceremonies of the Servant, to dwell in the House of his Son; the Ordinances of Bondage to become Ordinances of Liberty; the Rights of Servitude to become rights of Freedom, 'tis preposterous to think so of God.*

Well,

Well, but he is for a short view of this matter out of the New Testament; with all my heart; and see (he says) if any Man of common Ingenuity can imagine that this Ordinance is upon an equal foot there with Circumcision, and other Jewish Customs. Where I shall attend him. First, he says, there is a plain Command for it given by our Lord to his Apostles. But I have shewed him that 'tis a plain mistake; For as *Water*, the thing in Dispute, is not there mentioned, so it cannot be understood, without doing prejudice and dishonour to the Gospel. But he adds, and a Commission to empower them to administer it. What, to send Holy-Water from the tops of the fingers of a Man, so Holy as the Parson, to the forehead of an Infant to regenerate it? and inspire it with Courage as a valiant Soldier of Christ, by vertue of a Popish Cross made in its forehead: a vain whim! he adds, and their Successors. I fear he now means the Pope, let him deny it if he can, and then prove a better claim to such Power and Authority, as a Successor of the Apostles, than the Pope; or an Authority that he has, which is not derived from Rome, with whom his Brother Lesly shakes hands so kindly.

This of an outward Succession of the Apostles; by an outward Ordination, let the Men ordaining, and those ordained, be never so vicious and debauched in their Principles and Practices, as 'tis well known too many of the Protestant Clergy are now, as well as for many hundred years the Popish Clergy have been; yet (as it is observed in the Rights of the Christian Church, page 350.) they suggest, the Spiritual Power runs as clearly thro' their fingers ends, into the Noddles of all they lay their hands on, as water through a Conduit Pipe.

But with what confidence soever they impose upon the People, the *Truth* is, they only are *Successors* of the *Apostles*, who are called to the *Ministry*, not by *Man*, but by the *Holy Ghost*, and succeed them in the *Life* of *Righteousness* and *inward Purity*, by *inward Baptism* or *Washing*, the *true Initiating Ordinance* of the *Gospel*; and such Men as these it was in the *first Age* of *Christianity*, that God committed his word to; and were employed by him to feed his *Flock*, over whom the *Holy Ghost* made them *Overseers*, *Acts* 20. 28. who did it not for filthy lucre, *1 Pet.* 5. 2.

Well, but my Adversary quotes the Text *Mat.* 29. 19, 20. thus: *Jesus came and spake unto them saying, all Power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth, go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,—and lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the World. Here you have* (says he) *a solemn Commission given to the Apostles to Convert the Nations, and admit them by Baptism into the Church of Christ.*

I observe he puts *Conversion* before *Baptism*, how then will he justify the *Baptism* of *Infants* before they are *Converted*, or so much as capable of being *Taught*? is not this to wound himself? and if he means that none but those who are so sprinkled or washed with the *Element* of *Water*, are *Members* of *Christ's Church*; I must beg his leave to dissent from that *uncharitable Opinion*; and that all who are so sprinkled or washed, are *Members* thereof, and have *remission of Sins*, and the gift of the *Holy Ghost*, as page 39. he will make me not only almost, but even altogether a *Christian*, in *Contradiction* to the *Title* of his *Book*; nor can any

any
an e
If
Rea
(viz
Nam
and
Min
and
the
Fath
Holy
18.
3. 16
Th
ning
only
it had
ing of
of the
the re
the So
Adver
alas he
weakn
His
sue th
Liberty
a dark
in filth
elty! a
assisted
table!
With
has bes
Citation

any body then that he *Baptizes*, miss of *Heaven*, an easie way thither.

If he will not be angry, a Man of my mean Reading may tell him, what the Learned say (*viz.*) that the Greek *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* is *into the Name*, &c. and that the *Name of the Father Son and Holy Ghost*, into which they were by their Ministry, commanded to *Baptize*, is the *Power and Vertue of the Father Son and Holy Ghost*, not the *Element of Water*; for so the *Name of the Father &c.* is understood by *Holy Pen-men*, in the *Holy Scriptures*, as *Pf. 52. 9. 54. 1. 75. 1. Prov. 18. 10. Cant. 1. 3. Mic. 6. 9. John 20. 31. Acts 3. 16. 4. 10. 10. 43.* and many more places.

The latter part of his 39th Page, and beginning of his 40th, which end upon *Baptism*, serve only to shew his misapplication of *Tit. 3. 5.* as if it had respect to *outward washing*, when the *washing of Regeneration* is the *inward washing and work of the Spirit*, cleansing from the *filth of Sin*, and the *renewing of the Holy Ghost*, is a *quickenning of the Soul to a new Life of Holiness*; and that my Adversary thinks he has done *something*, when alas he has done *nothing*, but manifested his own weakness!

His last Paragraph shews how ready he is to sue that the *Quakers* may be restrained from the *Liberty of Pen and Ink*, and have *clean Straw and a dark Room*, as if they had not suffered enough in *filthy Holes and Dungeons already*. Oh Cruelty! and as if the *Dr.* that is supposed to have assisted him, had not yet Repented. Oh Lamentable!

With respect to the *Supper*, after my Adversary has bestowed near a Page and a half about my Citations out of *Godwin*, &c. to very little purpose,

he says, page 41. So far then our Author has gone to shew us, that this Supper was a Jewish Rite. If (says he) he means that this Custom of breaking Bread, and drinking Wine, was used when the Passover was celebrated, I shall not dispute that matter. And a little lower (he saith of me) he hath proved plainly that the Jews had this Rite. This is an honest Confession; and then he quotes me, saying, Now let us see if we can find any thing in it, that will make a standing Ordinance of it for the Gospel Church for ever, as the Passover was Instituted for the Legal. This (says he) is indeed putting the Case upon a fair Issue, if he would but take the right way to come at it; I mean, consult the Scriptures, and draw out thence, a full and impartial account of this matter; but alas (says he) this is none of his business! But alas say I, I cannot commend him, when he does not not speak Truth! But he is displeased with a parcel of awkward Interrogatories, as he calls them, which now follow, (*viz.*) Did Christ bring any of the Types and Figures of the Law into the Gospel? What answer does he make to this? why says he page 42. to oblige this Writer the more, I will give him leave to answer ay or no for me, as he thinks best: For certainly the breaking the Bread and drinking the Wine among the Jews, here alluded to, was no Type and Figure of Christ. Certainly then he ought to have proved it, and not have given us only his *Ipse Dixit* for it. But is not *in verbo Sacerdoti* enough to satisfy every sensible Man? who dares question the Truth of it, when a Priest has said it? who can have so little Faith as not to believe a Parson? to the Second Question, Is not Christ our Passover, the Antitypee of the Jewish Passover,

Pa
ly
the
is n
figu
Qu
he n
he v
the
rid
K. 3
dion
for t
they
But
of W
no fig
spilt
it, a
Quir
ting g
instea
The
little
few tr
purpo
Argum
the on
other;
Answer
To l
(says h
Supper
that th
Wine,

Passover, Sacrificed for us? my Adversary honestly answers yes.

But to proceed: *Is not his Body given for us, the substance of the figure of breaking the Bread? is not his Blood spilt for us, the substance of that figure, Wine, the blood of the Grape?* he says these Questions are something ensnaring, and therefore he must distinguish in his Answer to them. Now he wriggles; which puts me in mind of a Knack the Priests found out, (being sorely pinched) to rid themselves of the Oath they had taken to K. James II. by pleasing themselves with a Distinction between Kings *De Facto*, and Kings *De Jure*; for they have a faculty at distinguishing, when they are straitned, or their Interest lies at stake. But he says, *the breaking of Bread, and drinking of Wine, used at the Passover among the Jews, was no figure of the Body and Blood of Christ given and spilt for us?* How does he prove it? why he says it, and is not that enough? But perhaps his Quirk (to use his own words) lies here, in putting *given*, and *spilt*, in the *Preterperfect* Tense, instead of the *Future*.

The rest of his 42d Page, and his 43d, contain little besides Citations of my 2d Thoughts, and a few trifling Observations, that are nothing to the purpose. I shall therefore fall close upon the Argument, and Collect together his Concessions on the one hand, and his Principle Arguments on the other; and make Observations on the First, and Answers to the Last.

To begin with his Concessions, page 41. So far (says he) our Author has gone to shew us, that this Supper was a Jewish Rite. If (says he) he means that this Custom of breaking Bread, and drinking Wine, was used when the Passover was Celebrated,

I shall not dispute that matter with him; and a little lower, he hath proved plainly that the Jews had this Rite. And page 45. (my Adversary says) this Rite was borrowed from the Jews. So that Matter, is out of all manner of Dispute.

I shall therefore refresh his memory with a Quotation out of his Brother Leslys Book of Tythes, page 105, 106. The Gospel was not meant to overturn any thing in the Law, but to confirm it to the least Jota, by fulfilling all the Types of Christ; which as Shadows vanish of course, when the Substance is Come. And the Ceremonies which were ordained to accompany these Types, were with the Types fulfilled, that is, ended.

My Adversary has acknowledged, that the Passover was a Type of Christ; and that the Ceremony of eating Bread and drinking Wine, was used when the Passover was celebrated; and if his Brother Lesly is to be believed, the Type, and the Ceremonies accompanying it, are both fulfilled, that is (says he) ended. And my Adversary himself acknowledges, page 35. that the Judaical Observance of meat and drink, mentioned Col. 2. 16. is abolished. With what reason then does he plead for the observance of this Jewish Rite, which is confessedly abolished? why (says he) our Saviour said of it, do this in remembrance of me; which leads me to his Arguments.

I said in my 2d Thoughts, that do this, &c. might very well be understood to be meant only that time, without any violence offered to the place, which he seem'd not to argue against. But I now tell him the Learned say, this Text may be rendered Indicatively, because the Verb ποιειτε, is of the Indicative Mood; and then the Text runs thus, Luke 22. 19. εις την ευσυνηνην. Ye do this unto

unto my acceptance, or notice taking; for so the word remember sometimes signifies. Remember me, O my God, concerning this, *Neb.* 13. 14, 22. Remember me O Lord, with the Favour that thou bearest unto thy People, *Psal.* 106. 4. Lord remember me when thou comest into thy Kingdom, *Luke* 23. 42. that is, accept me, or take notice of me; which Interpretation is confirmed in this last Instance, and that in an especial manner; for as soon as the Penitent Thief had spoken these words, Jesus took particular notice of him; saying, verily I say unto thee, to day shalt thou be with me in Paradise, *v.* 43. Thus *Richard Claridge*, in his *Melius Inquirendum*, page 54. What then is become of the plain Command, and Institution, he would impose upon his Reader?

I must tell him he had the Civility to let alone the Arguments of my fourth Paragraph about the Supper; the Reader may guess at the Reason when he sees it, and therefore I transcribe that Paragraph; and to it shall add the next, as being neither fully nor fairly answered, for my Reader to review as follows. *Mat.* in Chap. 26. *v.* 26, 27, 28. and *Mark* Chap. 14. 22. 23, 24. 'mention only Matter of Fact, that Christ did eat this Passover, without saying of eating the Bread, do this in remembrance of me, as *Luke* does. But had they believed this to be the Sealing Ordinance of the Gospel, and that those words, do this in remembrance of me, made it so; to be sure they would by no means have omitted so Essential a thing. From which 'tis evident, do this in remembrance of me, had relation only to that time of their eating together, and not to the making of it the Great and Standing Or-

' dinance of the Gospel-Church. Had our Lord
 ' so intended, he would have been more Express
 ' and Full upon this Head; and told them, whether
 ' they must eat the whole Passover, or Bread and
 ' Wine only; and whether they must eat it once
 ' a Year, as the *Jew* did, or oft'ner? and that
 ' the same should remain for ever, for an Ordina-
 ' nance to his Church, in all Generations. We
 ' find *Moses* did so by the *Jews* in the time of
 ' the Law, and is said, for his Care, to have been
 ' Faithful in all his House, *Heb. 3. 2.* And shall
 ' we think the Son of God, if he had intended
 ' this Ceremony should have been perpetuated,
 ' would have been less Faithful in his House?
 ' The Evangelist *John*, wrote his History of the
 ' Gospel, along time after any of the rest; for
 ' he is said to have lived 68 Years after Christ,
 ' and to have wrote the same but a little before
 ' his Death, wherein he gives but a very transient
 ' touch of Jesus's Eating the Passover, *Chap. 13.*
 ' 1, 3. having not the least appearance in that ac-
 ' count, of its being a Gospel Ordinance, which
 ' by no means he would have omitted, if he that
 ' lean'd on his Lord's Bosom, at that time, and
 ' was more intimate with him than the rest of
 ' the Disciples had, learnt so of his Master: But one
 ' thing he is very particular in, and that is what
 ' Jesus did after Supper, how he ariseth from
 ' Supper, and laid aside his Garments, and took
 ' a Towel, and girded himself, and after he had
 ' poured Water in a Bason, began to wash his
 ' Disciples Feet, &c. *ver. 4, 5.* So (says the Apo-
 ' stle) after he had washed their Feet, and had
 ' taken his Garments, and was sate down again,
 ' he says unto them, Know ye what I have done
 ' unto you? Yecall me Master and Lord, and ye say
 ' well,

Wr
 a I
 not
 this
 was
 tha
 An
 fall
 E
 Ver
 bless
 on.
 Sel
 Cra

' well, for so I am: If I then your Lord and
 ' Master, have washed your Feet, ye also ought
 ' to wash one another's Feet; for I have given
 ' you an Example, that ye should do as I have
 ' done to you, *ver. 12, to 15.* Now in the Sup-
 ' per, in the Beginning and End thereof, *Godwin*
 ' tells us, That his Practice was suitable to the
 ' *Jews*; but in this of the Lord and Master's
 ' washing the Feet of his Disciples, he differed
 ' from them, for that was the Work of a Servant;
 ' therefore has in it a Greater Appearance of a
 ' new Institution than any thing that passed at
 ' the Supper. In the Supper he only says, Do
 ' this in Remembrance of me; which without a-
 ' ny Violence offered to the Place, may very well
 ' be understood to be ment only at that time;
 ' but with respect to this Place, it cannot be so
 ' understood, without offering Violence to the
 ' Place: If I then your Lord and Master have
 ' washed your Feet, ye also **ought** to wash one
 ' another's Feet; for I have given you an Example
 ' that ye should do as I have done to you, *v. 15.*

This High-Priest says of me, Page 49. *If this*
Writer doth not understand the Difference between
a Positive Precept, and a bare Example, he ought
not to have burthened the Press with his Thoughts on
this Head. As if Christ's saying, *Ye ought to*
wash one another's Feet, was no Precept. Is not
 that like a Doctor, to call this a **bare Example**?
 And to use his own Words again, *Who can help*
falling down to such Demonstration?

But (says he, *ibid.*) *He that bath the necessary*
Vertue of Humility, effectually answers all that our
blessed Lord enjoined him to imitate by that Acti-
on. (Here he makes it an **Injunction** to his
Self-Contradiction, in saying it was a **bare**
Example.) But then, say I, (*Argumentum ad*
Homi-

ad Hominum) He that hath the Grace of Remembering the *Death* and *Sufferings* of our Saviour for us, *Effectually* answers the End of Imitating the *Outward Supper*; which *Outward Supper* may then be, as justifiably *disused*, by the one, as *washing one another's Feet* by the other; since daily Experience tells us, the *need* there is of being put in mind of *Humility*, as well as of the *Dying of Christ* for us.

It appearing by the Arguments aforesaid, that our Saviour did not intend this *Ceremony* or *Shadow*, of *Bread* and *Wine*, for a *standing Ordinance* to his Church; I shall proceed to shew, that the *Apostle Paul*, in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*, had no *such* Notion of it, in Answer to what my *Antagonist* advances on this Head, in his Pages, 46, 47, and 48. For,

First, I see no *necessity* of believing what he says of that *Apostle's* receiving a *new Revelation* about Christ's last Supper, because there could be no need of an *Immediate Revelation* of *so late* a Fact, *so well witnessed* by the *Disciples*; but having the Account thereof from *them*, he might call it a Receiving thereof from the *Lord Jesus*, though it was *Mediately* Mat. 10. 40.

Secondly, Having given them the Account, he is *so far* from enjoining them the *Observance* of that *Supper* as a *perpetual standing Ordinance*, that he leaves, the very thing it self, with an *Indifferency*, as to future Practice, saying only, 1 Cor. 11. 26. *As often as ye eat that Bread, &c.* which is *far short* of a Command. If I should say to my Adversary, *As often as* thou goest to *London*, call upon thy Brother *Lesly*; would he say that I *Commanded* him to go to *London*, much less to go thither *often*?

Thirdly,

Thirdly, The Apostle makes this Supper, to be but a *Shewing the Lord's Death*. Where then had the Priest the Notion, of its being appointed *A standing Means of Grace in the Christian Church*? Page 56. to be sure not from the *Scriptures*; and therefore the same is to be *rejected*.

Fourthly, *'Till he comes*; which may be understood thus: Use the *Ceremony*, or *Shadow*, 'till you enjoy the *Substance*: Practice the *outward Supper*, 'till our Lord Jesus Christ comes, to **Confirm** you to the end, that you may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus, 1 Cor. 1. 7, 8. and you come to *Sup* Inwardly with him, and he with you, Rev. 3. 20. Those that thus use the Sign, we do not condemn; though those that are come to the *Substance*, we know have no need of the *Shadow*.

But my Adversary, Page 48. bids me, *Ruminate upon the Dignity of this holy Ordinance, employed* (I suppose he means implied) *in the great Guilt of an unworthy Reception*. It seems in *Carolina*, a Party had *ruminated* so long upon this Head, that at last they passed a Bill, about two or three Years ago, to Excuse Persons in Places that did not go to any Dissenting Meeting, from partaking thereof, if they should declare they thought themselves *unworthy*; though at the same time, if a Person thought himself *worthy*, and yet on any occasion went to the *Worship* of God with Dissenters, that should *disqualifie* him for a Place, and also from having a *Vote* in the *Electi-on* of their Assembly-Men.

Well, but what shall we learn, by what the Apostle says about an *unworthy Reception*? Why that this *Ceremony*, that was then observed, in respect to Christ, tho' without a Commandment, should be performed by *Holy Persons*,
else

else they that use it, are *condemned*, as the Margin reads it: The Case was much the same in the time of the Law. But what then shall we think of the many *debauched* Persons, as well of the Clergy, as of the *Laity*, that partake of *that Sign*, or Ceremony, not *decerning the Lord's Body*? Whose Body is not *that Bread*, but a *Heavenly Spiritual Substance*, participated by the Faithful, even in the *Disuse* of the Sign, as daily Experience evinceth.

In his Page 44. he seems offended, that I said, the Greek reads, *Heb. 9. 10. Divers Baptisms*, tho' he cannot deny it; yet nevertheless, approves of its being translated *Divers Washings*; because he says, *Baptism is now a Word of Art*: But I ask who made it so? For I desire him to remember his own Words, Page 36. (*viz.*) *To baptize, and to wash, are Words originally of the same import*. And I tell him, so little Learning as I have in the Greek, (which I own is very little) I am able to read in the *Greek Testament*, *Heb. 9. 10. Βαπτισμοις*, (that is in English Letters) *Baptismois*; translated in the *Latin Testament*, *Baptismatibus*. And let any Man that understands those Languages, tell me if *Baptisms* be not the true and proper English for that Word, because I am for naked Truth without *art*; and if that don't suit the Parson, it does the *Druggot-Maker*: And so it is rendred by his *Reverend Wall*, in his *History of Baptism*; and many other Learned Men. And *ex abundanti* (to use his own Phrase) if he himself understands *Greek*, to be sure he knows the *Greek Word* reads it *Baptisms*; and then what an unfair, and disingenious Writer must he be, to endeavour to *impose* upon his *Reader* herein, as he hath done!

Having

Havin^g gone through the Arguments respecting to those *two Signs*, or *Ceremonies*, I shall proceed to take notice of my *Adversary's* Objections, against *some* of the Persons I quoted, respecting their Opinion in Relation to this Subject.

And first, He objects against those which I quoted, saying, 'That the Mystery of the unspeakable invisible Power, ought not to be performed by visible and corruptible Elements, nor that of incomprehensible and incorporeal things, be represented by sensible and corporeal Things; but that the Knowledge of the unspeakable Majesty, is it self perfect Redemption (or Baptism) alledging, That they were *Hereticks*. No wonder he should call them, *so*, for if nothing else had been laid to their Charge, this Opinion of *theirs* had been *enough*, with this *Priest*, to merit that *Appellation*; and I do not wonder at all, to hear him call *Men*, who lived about 1600 Years ago, *Hereticks*, since he cannot forbear calling the *Quakers*, *so*. And if after the *Quakers* have answered the horrid *Blasphemies* and *Heretical Tenets*, which their *Adversaries* would lay to *their* Charge, Page 30. and fairly cleared themselves of *such Imputations*, as in their *Switch for the Snake*, &c. they shall yet be *Calumniated* by such as this *Priest*, 'tis not to be minded how *such* serve Antiquity.

Let him produce *any* Book (that he can prove was written by those he calls *Valentinians*, which yet were professed Christians, tho' called by their *Adversaries* *Hereticks*, (*viz.*) Erroneous in the Faith) that contain those *Errors* he charges upon *them*, if he can; but if he cannot do that, I am not bound to take the *Articles* of their Faith from their *Adversaries*, any more than I am the Faith

of

of *Protestants* from the hands of *Papists*, or of *Quakers* from the hands of their *Enemies*. I know this is not just, and so does my *Adversary* too.

Of as little Credit are his Charges against *Quintilla*, the *Woman Preacher*, who lived about 100 Years after the *Apostles*, and taught that *Water-Baptism* was needness, and that *Faith* alone was sufficient. Of a Piece, with which is his Objection to those *Augustin* mentions, that said, *Baptism in Water* did no body good.

The *Priest* leaps over my six next *Quotations*, which therefore I shall present *here*, to my Readers view, as follows.

' *Theodoret* in his *lib. 4. chap. 10.* mentions
' some about 260 Years after the *Apostles*, that
' said, There is no Profit accruing to the Baptized, by Baptism; and that they had noted Men
' of their Sect (*viz.*) *Dadoes, Sabbas, Adelphius, Hermes* and *Simeonis*; the whole Number then
' must be considerable, to have so many noted Men amongst them.

' Then to come to about the Middle Ages of
' Christianity, *Dacherius, Specileg T. 13.* says,
' That those that adhered to one *Gundulphus*, about *Anno 1025.* being some of them Examined
' by the Bishop of *Cambray*, denied that Baptism can do any good to Infants; and being further
' Interrogated, confessed, They thought Water-Baptism of no Use or Necessity to any one, Infant, or Adult.

' About this time it was, that King *Robert* of
' *France*, caused to be burnt alive, nigh 14 of
' the Chief Clergy, and more Noble of the *Licks*, of the City of *Orleance*, for denying the
' Outward Baptism and Supper: *Analus, p.*

103. &c. *J. Pithæus Fragments of History: Johan. Florentius*, in his *Epistle to Oliva, Papir Mas-son* in his *Annals of France*, lib. 3.

Everanious, of the *Diocess of Cologne*, about 1140. speaks of a People that they Contemn the Sacraments.

Peter Abbot of Clugny, Anno 1146. in one of his *Epistles*, says, Bruce, with Henry his Disciple, and their Followers, did hold not only what Berengarius had said (viz.) That there is no Transubstantiation in the Sacrament, was true; but also, that that Sacrament is no more to be administred since Christ's time.

Ecbertus Schonagienfis, wrote a *Treatise* Anno 1160. against a People that spread in many Countries, who (says he) our Germans call Cathari Puritans, of whom he says, They held no Water-Baptism at all does any good for Salvation.

But he falls upon me with respect to my 10th Authority, about spelling the Name of a Place wrong, a greivous Error; what shall I do now? what spell the Name of a Place wrong? Oh Lamentable! can such a Man be a Christian? and yet this Priest has not spelled it in his quotation of me, as I did; as any body by comparing my 2d Thoughts with his Book, may see, if my Adversary, that is a Man of such great depth in Learning, mistook in spelling the word after me; no wonder that a Man of my mean Learning, should commit such a Litteral Error, and make such mighty Diversion for this Priest, but now let him laugh at himself, for committing the Error he exposes; at the same time he reproves it, and in the same word too: This must needs be very pleasant, and shews the Priest to be in the Pit he had digged for me.

My

My next he passeth without any notice, which is as follows.

The Famous Waldenses, as a People about this time, laid little stress upon the Outward Baptism and Supper, finding fault with the Papists, for relying too much on these things. Some of these held, as Reinerius says, that the Sacrament of Baptism of material Water, and other Sacraments profit nothing to Salvation.

On my last relating to Beza's Annotations on the New Testament, he is offended that I call the Bible Printed at Holland, in our Language, the Dutch Bible; which is another of his petty Quarrels; and shews that common acceptation will not pass with him. He says with Beza, *He that hath Christ, may require nothing else; and that he agrees with Beza in the Reason he renders for the disuse of Circumcision of the Flesh; because without it, we are circumcised within, by the Vertue of Christ.* But is mightily displeased with my Inference, that by the same Parity of Reason, *Water-Baptism may be disused, because without it, we are baptized within, by the Vertue of Christ.* But there is no avoiding the Force of this Argument, unless it can be proved, that we are not, and cannot be baptized within, unless we are baptized without. If this High-Priest will undertake that Province, the World would have an Opportunity to judge of that Performance. His mighty Wit in saying, *Oh my dear Dove, I could hug thee fore ever,* serves only to shew his Vain Fancy, or the Faculty he has at Hugging.

His recommending this Parity of Reason, to all that value what he calls my Logick, shews what a profound Logician he would have the World believe him to be: But for my own part, I care not how

how
wh
stia
but
Nie
on
Kno
on
and
read
gent
Hea
them
i Jo
at a
that
more
them
teach
Man's
In
pleas
the F
I ask
his Pl
firmi
&c. a
that S
that C
Auf
Monic
Am
Greg
Aust
Miracle
Chry
with Al

how little Skill I have in that *Art of Wrangling*, with which the Schools have so much perplexed the *Christian Religion*: A Religion plain and easy in it self; but now so clouded and veiled, by the *Distinctions* and *Niceties* of Schoolmen, to keep the People depending on them, that the Commonalty despairing of the Knowledge of Religion themselves, pin their Faith on the Priests sleeves, to the great Prejudice of Piety and Vertue. But would Men seriously, and frequently read that *Book of God*, the *Bible*, and attend diligently on *God's Teachings* by his blessed Spirit in the Heart, they would not need, that any Man Teach them, but as the same Anointing teacheth them, 1 John 2. 27. By which means they would arrive at a saving and experimental Knowledge of the things that belong to their Peace; and this would do them more good, than all the Sermons their Priests read them, or the Logick and Philosophy which the Schools teach; which Jargon serves rather to Confound a Man's Sense, than to Edify his Soul.

In his last Paragraph on this Head, he seems displeased, that I would not take all for Truth, that the Fathers have said, as if he did. And therefore I ask him what he thinks of what *de Laune* says in his Plea for the Non-conformists, viz. *Cyprian's* affirming, *The Church of Rome to be the Mother Church*, &c. and opposing the Marriage of Priests, holding that Sins are done away by Alms and Good Works, that Crism and Exorcism are absolutely necessary.

Austin prays for the Dead, the Soul of his Mother Monica.

Ambrose for the Soul of Theodosius.

Gregory for the Soul of Trajan.

Austin, a great Friend of Relicks, affirming great Miracles wrought by them.

Chrysostom was for offering Prayers for the Dead with Alms and Oblations.

Jerome, a great Defender of Relicks, and Adoration of them.

Such usage of the Fathers (he says) I must confess would tempt a Man to drop a word or two, did I not consider from whom it comes. But when he has read Daille's Right use of the Fathers, and Bishop Taylor's Liberty of Prophesying; yea, and his Reverend Wall, of several of them too, let him drop his word or two if he thinks fit.

Of the Hat and Language.

My Adversary says, We do all acknowledge, that a Man ought to uncover his Head in Divine Worship, as an outward Signification of Honour to God: But adds, It was expected that I should now shew the weakness of that distinction, I made in my first, between Civil and Religious Honour; and that we cannot salute our superiours with the Hat, without fancying we are paying an Act of Worship to God Almighty. To which I answer, the Salutation of the Hat, was not in use in the Apostles Time, nor till the corrupter Ages of Christianity. But in the Apostles Time God required that Honour to be done to himself, and therefore to give that Honour to Men, which he hath set apart for himself, and was not done to Men in the purer Ages of Christianity, is to give his Glory to another; and favours too much the Errors of the Romanists, in paying the Worship and Honour to Images, that is due to God alone; in doing which, the Doctrine of Intention, will not excuse them.

He says, The same may be said of their Thee's and Thou's; they must shew the Customary way of speaking forbidden in Holy Scripture, or they can never defend such an affronting Singularity. I answer, let the Priest shew, that the Customary way of Speaking, which he pleads for, was the Custom of the Times, when the Scriptures were wrote, and then he does something,

this
pro
The
was
som
to
Corr
flatt
Nat
Good
in E
U
very
Qual
thing
My
rushin
upon
Hat
descen
Jesus
ful A
practi
does
done,
Christ
called
not Tr
son.
To
a depar
postles,
plainnes
and we
what th
saith th
Customs

thing, but this I presume he will never be able to prove; and if so, then 'tis manifest that *Thee* and *Thou*, is not only the *Dialect* of Holy Scripture, but was also the common *Dialect* of those Ages, and which some say is preserved and kept to, in certain Countries to this day. And since he cannot deny but *this Corruption in Speech* had an Evil original, to wit, to flatter Princes and great Men, unless he can prove the Nature of this Corruption is changed, from Evil to Good, it remains Evident, that the *Quakers* do well in *Eschewing* the same.

Upon my saying, in my second Paper, *That I am very sensible that 'tis very great Self-denial, in the sincere Quaker, to deviate from Custom in these things: Nothing less than pure Conscience obliging him thereto.* My Adversary says, *Without doubt to see a Person rushing into a Room among his Betters, like an Engine upon Screws, thee-ing one and thou-ing another, with his Hat upon his head, must be a wonderful Instance of Condescension and Self-denial, and approve him a Follower of Jesus and his Disciples.* Reader, Is not this a wonderful Answer? Let him shew that this was not the practice of Christ and his Apostles; and then he does something against the *Quakers*, but till that be done, he must own the *Quakers* are Followers of Christ and his Apostles in these things. And to be called for following them, *Engines upon Screws*, will not Trouble the *Quakers*, though it *Exposes* the *Parson*.

To conclude on this Head, as these Customs are a departing from the Practice of Christ and his Apostles, so they are also vain, and inconsistent with the plainness and simplicity that is in Christ, 2 Cor. 11. 3. and were taken from the Heathen. But let us hear what the Prophet Jeremiah says, Chap. 10. 2, 3. *Thus saith the Lord, learn not the way of the Heathen—For the Customs of the People are vain.* And we are to be re-

deemed from our vain Conversation received by Tradition from our Fathers, 1 Pet. 1. 18.

So that, doubtless, the *Quakers* have better Reasons for their Singularities, as he calls them, than the Priest and his Brethren can render; for their *Rose Hat-bands*, their little Bands about their Necks; their black Coats under, and white Coats a top, resembling the Saint without, and the Devil within. The *Quakers* received theirs from Christ and his Disciples; but the Parson, his from the Pope and his Followers. As he did their Gossips in Baptism; their Kneeling at the Communion; (as they call it) their worshipping towards the East; their bowing when the Letters J, E, S, U, S, are pronounced; Churching of Women; Form of Marriage; Consecration of Churches; (so called) and of Burying Ground; the Observation of Saints days; Christmas, Candlemas, &c. and most of the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, which make the High-Church Priests, that are most fond of these human Inventions, (not to be found in our Rule of Faith, the Bible) strange sort of Engines, that are moved, not with Screws, but internal Springs, of the Pope in their Bellies.

Respecting Womens Preaching. He tells me, p. 50. He hath read Lock's Paraphrase, and finds he will do my Cause no service; for (says my Antagonist) he declares that the Propheying mentioned by St. Paul, was a spiritual Gift, performed by the Immediate, and Extraordinary Motion of the Holy Ghost. And (says he) when the Speaking Sisters can give good Evidence of this, it will be time enough to consider their Claim. This seems a plain Confession, That their Speaking in the Church is lawful, under such Qualifications. And I must tell the Parson, that the Effects of their Ministry have been such, in the Church, that the same is very good Evidence of their Claim; as well as that the words of Peter, Acts 2. 16, 17, 18. shew, that

that

that *Women* spake in that Assembly, when the *Holy Ghost* was first poured out. For, says he, this is that which was spoken by the Prophet Joel. And it shall come to pass in the last days, (saith God) I will pour out of my Spirit upon all Flesh, and your Sons and your Daughters shall Prophesie—And on my Servants, and on my **Hand Maidens**, I will pour out in those days of my Spirit, and they shall Prophesie. Philip had four **Daughters** that Prophesied, Acts 21. 8, 9. And the Apostle Paul says, I intreat thee also, true Yoke-Fellow, help those **Women** which **Labour** with me in the Gospel; with Clement also, and with other my Fellow-Labourers, whose Names are in the Book of Life, Phil. 4. 3. And the same Apostle describing the *Mein* and *Posture*, that *Women* ought in the Church to Pray and Prophesie in, 1 Cor. 11. 5. shews beyond dispute, that what he says, 1 Cor. 14. 34, 35. against their Speaking in the Church, is not to be understood respecting their Praying, or Prophesying, but indeed such a Speaking, as the very Text sheweth, (*viz.*) a Speaking to **Learn**, and not to Teach, (*viz.*) the troubling a divided Church, with unnecessary Questions; and therefore in that Case, if they will **Learn** any thing, let them ask their Husbands at home, (concerning the Mind of the Church) for 'tis a shame for a Woman to be so troublesome, in Meetings for adjusting Disputes, and governing of the Church; such a Subjection as this, is all that can reasonably be gathered from this Place, and 1 Tim. 2. 11, 12.

As to the Variation between the London and Bristol Prints, as my second Paper was entirely my own, so the same being in the Press at London, when I came up, I revised it, partly, my self, and made some Alterations in the working it off, which I hoped might have reached Bristol, soon enough to have altered the Press there; which was at work, from a Proof of the London Print, and not from a Manuscript;

Script; but the *Printer* there, being too far gone therein, was the Cause of their Variation; and not the *statutum est of the Friends*, as my Adversary idly suggests. For there was never a Paper wrote more freely and voluntary, by any Person, than my second Paper was by me, without the least Constraint or Threatning, from any Body, or the least worldly Advantage: Being the Effect purely of renewed Light, and Convictions of my own Conscience. So that all the Priest says, page 55, &c. of wriggling, twisting, and begging off, &c. while this Piece was Composing, are most idle Chimera's; and false Divinations of his own Brain.

My Antagonist says, page 53. *If the Reader pleases to run over my three next Paragraphs; Of Education of Children; Of the Ministry; Of the Quakers Discipline in General; he will see that they need no Observations; and indeed it would be (says he) a piece of Cruelty to make any.* And yet if it be Cruelty, he cannot forbear it, in page 54. & 55. Nor indeed do I think he would spare any Cruelty towards me, that is in his Power.

His 54th Page, and a considerable part of his 55th, have divers Quotations out of my First and Second Papers, to shew that my last contradicted my first, which I believe the Reader will not wonder at, since that was apparently the Design of it. For being angry, hurried, unsettled, and thereby darkened in my Mind, when I wrote my first: As soon as it pleased God to restore my Sight and Senses to me, and a Spirit of Love and Forgiveness, which was in good measure within five or six days after the Publication thereof, my Conscience told me I had done amiss, and wrote against former Convictions, in divers Things: And therefore I stop'd the dispersing of those I had Printed. But when I saw my Paper Reprinted, and dispersed, whether I would or no; I held my

my

my self bound in Conscience, as publickly to Contradict what I had written (in such Confusion, and Disorder of Mind, that I knew not what I did) contrary to the, now again, renewed Convictions of the Spirit of God in my Heart; which being sensible of, I readily again yeilded to; in regard to the Glory of God, as well as the Peace and Quiet of my own Conscience. I am therein doubtless the Wonder of the Age, and perhaps the only Monument of our day, of the Mercy and Goodness of God, so seedily manifested to a Person under such great Prejudice. But God, that knows the inward Love I still retained to the Life, and Spirit of Religion, remembred me, as he did Peter, when he had denied his Master, and Cursed and Swore, he knew him not, and broke my Heart, and humbled my Soul before him, and made me weep bitterly, as well as him.

I as little thought that Provocation or Prejudice, would have made me think of Changing my Profession, as Peter did, that Fear would make him deny his Lord. I that so well knew the Principles of my Profession, and had so often been successful in their Vindication, and Promulgation, that Clouds should so darken my Understanding, as to make me think I did well in opposing them; O surprizing Thought! the Lord best knows the purpose of his own Will, in suffering these things. For how unsearchable are his Judgments, and his Ways past finding out, Rom. 11. 33.

I thank God I am not ashamed to own his Mercy, in restoring to me the Joy of his Salvation, and upholding me with his free Spirit, Psal. 51. 12. And I patiently bare (for Christ's sake) the Scorn and Reproach my Adversary hath treated me with, in his 55th Page, and elsewhere.

I am before hand with the Priest in Comparing my two Papers. I have reflected on my Motives in both the

[50]

the *undertakings*. With respect to the *First*, I have repented, and (I trust) amended; and, relating to the *Last*, I see no need of either; because the same was purely in Obedience to God's *Light* in my Soul, and for no worldly Advantage whatsoever. And let me then return him his own Advice, by bidding him reflect upon the *Motive*, which induced him to his *undertaking* against me; and tell me, whether it was not worldly Gain or Advantage, that made him come to this *Parish* as a Preacher, and give so many Guineas for the Place? Nay, let him satisfy the World what his *Motive* is, if not *Covetousness*, that makes him put the People off with his *Readment*, once a day at *Melksham*, to save the Charges of a *Curate* for *Seend*? And let him justify himself, if he can, for refusing to sign the *Bishop* of *Sarum's* Address to the *Queen*, that the *Church* is not in *Danger*, &c. And when this is done, let him seriously consider his *Motives* to *Hunting*, *Card-playing*, &c. If, therefore, he retires half an hour, every day, and considers seriously his *Life* and *Manners*, and the *Motives* thereof, and makes *due* Reflections thereon, to a *thorough* Repentance and Amendment; his Receipt may do himself, as much good as any Body, and (to use the *Priests* words) with this Advice I take my leave for the present of my *Quondam* Friend.

Melksham, the 16th of the
third Month, called
May, 1707.

Thomas Beaven, Jun.

E R R A T A.

Page 4. Line 26. read *Self-Contradictions*. p. 19 l. 7. leave out *and*. p. 24 l. 14. read *Categorical*. and l. 23. *Sacraments*. p. 25 l. 11. read *take notice*. p. 26 l. 16. read *Water is not there*, and l. 22. and then the *Word Water*. p. 32 l. 23. read *Adopt*.

e
o
e
l,
d
l
d
e,
at
d
m
e-
h
ne
fy
of
is
m
d-
r,
h-
e-
d-
as
his
ms
n.
24
no
ora